

# EXHIBIT B

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL  
ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

---

IN RE: DIGITAL ADVERTISING  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

MDL No. 3010  
July 29, 2021  
10:43 a.m.

---

TRANSCRIPT OF ORAL ARGUMENT

Chair: Honorable Karen K. Caldwell, Chair  
United States District Court  
Eastern District of Kentucky

Members: Honorable Catherine D. Perry  
United States District Court  
Eastern District of Missouri

Honorable Nathaniel M. Gorton  
United States District Court  
District of Massachusetts

Honorable Matthew F. Kennelly  
United States District Court  
Northern District of Illinois

Honorable David C. Norton  
United States District Court  
District of South Carolina

Honorable Roger T. Benitez  
United States District Court  
Southern District of California

Honorable Dale A. Kimball  
United States District Court  
District of Utah

DEBRA M. JOYCE, RMR, CRR, FCRR  
Official Court Reporter  
John J. Moakley U.S. Courthouse  
1 Courthouse Way, Room 5204  
Boston, MA 02210  
joycedebra@gmail.com

1 APPEARANCES:

2 Eric Mahr, Esq.  
3 Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer, LLP  
For Google, LLC

4 Kevin J. Orsini, Esq.  
5 Cravath, Swaine & Moore, LLP  
For Facebook, Inc.

6 Kate M. Baxter-Kauf, Esq.  
7 Lockridge Grindal Nauen, P.L.L.P.  
For SPX Total Body Fitness, LLC

8 Jordan Elias, Esq.  
9 Girard Sharp, LLP  
For Surefreight Global, LLC, et al.

10 Carol O'Keefe, Esq.  
11 Korein Tillery, LLC  
For Genius Media Group, Inc., et al.

12 Serina M. Vash, Esq.  
13 Herman Jones, LLP  
For AIM Media Indiana Operating, LLC, et al.

14 John Thorne, Esq.  
15 Kellogg, Hansen, Todd, Figel & Frederick, P.L.L.C.  
For Associated Newspapers Ltd., et al.

16 Jonathan Rubin, Esq.  
17 MoginRubin, LLP  
For Clifffy Care Landscaping, LLC

18 W. Mark Lanier, Esq.  
19 The Lanier Law Firm, P.C.  
For States of Texas, et al.

20

21

22

23

24

25

1                   We will turn to the next counsel, Mark Lanier.

2                   MR. LANIER: May it please the court, thank you, your  
3 Honors. My name is Mark Lanier. I represent a number of  
4 the -- well, I represent all of the states and the District of  
5 Puerto Rico, Alaska, Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Indiana,  
6 Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada,  
7 North and South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Puerto Rico.

8                   I oppose centralization of this case, and with that, I  
9 will commence. May it please the Court.

10                  Judge Kennelly, I'm coming straight to you because  
11 this is the first time in my entire life to argue for no  
12 centralization in front of the JPML, and I will be using some  
13 of the arguments that have been used so effectively against me  
14 over the years as I try to do this.

15                  There are three arguments to make in two quick  
16 minutes.

17                  Number one, urgency. Speed really is important here.  
18 It's important for a number of reasons, including the fact that  
19 there's an inherent amount of immense power that we've seen  
20 exercised in elections and other places as well in the hands of  
21 Google. And we believe that the legislators recognize the  
22 importance of urgency here. We have tried to do what we think  
23 the JPML has urged us to do before, and that is, consolidate  
24 all of these cases. Even the two pending cases wanting to  
25 intervene in Louisiana and South Carolina are seeking our

1       counsel as well, and that I'll represent Louisiana in that  
2 intervention and ultimately South Carolina I expect as well.  
3 So we're trying to consolidate as best as we can without  
4 imposing on the JPML and all that it requires.

5           It's also important for the court to understand that  
6 we've been intensely involved in this. We've got two years  
7 going now because of all of the pretrial work. We took over 50  
8 statements, equivalent to depositions, before filing the case.  
9 We've got over two million documents. We've got documents and  
10 information from 25 third parties at this point. We have won  
11 the 1404 transfer motion because Google uses Texas as one of  
12 its nexus points for all of its technology.

13           So within the framework of that argument, two,  
14 substance. The *parens patriae* not covered here. We are  
15 seeking to recover for individuals in a different sense. For  
16 example, we want to disgorge the private data that's been  
17 secured wrongly by Facebook.

18           Final point, three, clarification. Judge Jordan has  
19 taken a strong look at this case, a strong active involvement.  
20 He's issued a protective order, he's issued a 1404 motion.  
21 We've got discovery under way, we've got -- documents have been  
22 scheduled.

23           Thank you.

24           JUDGE CALDWELL: Questions for Mr. Lanier?

25           Judge Kennelly.

1                   JUDGE KENNELLY: I have two, let me ask the first one,  
2 and then I'll ask the other one.

3                   The first one goes back to the questions I asked some  
4 of the other folks, which are really more questions for you.

5                   So I get that you're asking to break up and I get that  
6 you're asking for disgorgement, but the complaint also says  
7 you're asking for damages. And as I understand the *parens*  
8 *patriae* part of the claim which has been described by some of  
9 the other counsel, you're suing on behalf of natural persons,  
10 quote-unquote, that's what the statute says, and you have to  
11 carve out any business entities or anything like that.

12                  So am I right -- so who are the -- what's the damage  
13 to the natural persons in the 14 or so states that you  
14 represent?

15                  MR. LANIER: Your Honor, the damage falls by and large  
16 into the civil protection actions that I'd emphasize to you  
17 right now. In Texas it's the Deceptive Trade Practices Act.  
18 It says that an entity, like Google, cannot falsely  
19 misrepresent that they're destroying everybody's individual  
20 data and not selling it when, in fact, they are selling it and  
21 they're not destroying it. And so we've got an action for  
22 that. That's not found in any of the class actions that have  
23 been sought. That is solely an individual distinct action.

24                  Yes, sir.

25                  JUDGE KENNELLY: So my question was what about

1                   JUDGE CALDWELL: Hearing none, we have your argument,  
2 and that concludes the matter MDL number 3010, and our  
3 arguments for the day.

4                   The panel will be in recess.

5                   (Court adjourned at 11:20 a.m.)

6                   - - - - -

7                   CERTIFICATION

8                   I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript  
9 of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter to  
10 the best of my skill and ability.

11

12

13

14

/s/Debra M. Joyce  
Debra M. Joyce, RMR, CRR, FCRR  
Official Court Reporter

August 3, 2021  
Date

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25